



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EXPENDITURES.

Publication of Vol. IX, 1,	\$297 79
Reprints,	54 18
Publication of Vol. IX, 2,	306 27
Reprints,	60 30
Publication of Vol. IX, 3,	234 88
Reprints,	22 00
Publication of Vol. IX, 4,	278 94
Reprints,	46 35
Job Printing,	26 00
Expenditures of the Secretary,	45 11
“ “ “ Treasurer,	18 10
Stenographer,	50 00
Janitor,	6 00
<hr/>	
Total expenditures for the year,	\$1,445 92
Balance on hand December 23, 1894,	437 29
<hr/>	
	\$1,883 21
<hr/>	
Balance on hand December 23, 1894,	\$437 29

The President appointed the following Committees :

- (1) To audit the Treasurer's accounts: Professors O. F. Emerson and C. F. Brédé.
- (2) To nominate officers: Professors H. E. Greene, F. B. Gummere, H. C. G. von Jagemann, Gustav Gruener, T. P. Harrison.
- (3) To recommend place for the next Annual Meeting: Professors J. M. Hart, Albert S. Cook, J. T. Hatfield, Charles Harris, J. M. Garnett.

The reading of papers was then begun.

1. “Matthias de Vries and his contributions to Netherland Philology.” By Professor W. T. Hewett, of Cornell University.

It is seldom that a nation pays homage to a single scholar as the founder of its philology and of the critical study of its literature, as does the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the person of Professor Matthias de Vries. Not only his native land, but the larger country where his language is spoken, embracing Belgium, recognizes its debt to him. For a half century he was

the foremost scholar and leader in the study of his native language. The impress of his remarkable powers has been felt not only in his contributions to philology, but in fashioning the form and determining the future of his country's speech. In this memorial gathering I shall seek to recognize briefly his place in the history of Germanic philology, and our indebtedness to him.

His birth, his environment and his gifts fitted him preëminently for the work which he was destined to do. His father was a Remonstrant preacher of Haarlem, and, like many of the clergy of the Netherlands, of unusual learning, whose home was a centre for the association of scholars, and whose classical attainments were so great as to cause his name to be proposed for professorships both at Groningen and Leiden, but whose permanent fame is due to his learned investigations in the history of the invention of printing. His uncle, Jeronimo de Vries, was an eminent official of the city of Amsterdam, honored alike for patriotism and for his contributions to the history of his country. Bilderdijk often visited in the family of de Vries, and his keen and fruitful intellect may have inspired the boy with his first enthusiasm for the literature of his native land. In a circle so patriotic, where fostering the national language was a favorite subject of conversation, it would have been strange if the young scholar had not received unconsciously the direction of his future work. From 1838-43 he was a student at Leiden under the famous professors Peerkamp, Bake and Geel. Leiden was especially distinguished at that time for the critical direction of its scholarship, which it had retained from Wyttenbach and the great classical scholars of the past. His first distinction was won in classical scholarship. Before receiving a degree at the University of Leiden, he wrote a work upon *De Polybii pragmatica* (1842), which was crowned by the University of Groningen.

The change in the national government of 1795, by which the Princes of Orange were driven from the stadtholdership, and the Batavian Republic constituted, wrought a tremendous and vital change in popular thought. It produced a revolt against a stiff ecclesiasticism in the state, and against the dominance of classical models in education. Though the nation was under a foreign conqueror, there was the feeling of a new life in the present, and with it the growth of a national spirit and the cultivation of the national language and literature, and the abolition of foreign standards of speech. The first chairs for the study of the national language were established at this time, and Siegenbeek, an eloquent preacher who used the Netherland language with a purity and beauty, and spoke with an eloquence hitherto unknown in the Dutch pulpit, was appointed the first professor in this department at Leiden. In 1815, instruction in the history of the Netherlands was added to that of the language. Neither the study of the language or the literature had previously been absolutely neglected. There was no unity in the speech of the people; the strong individualism of the different provinces had fostered dialects; the language of the court

was French, and the higher classes deigned to address inferiors alone in the popular tongue. An absurd official language had grown up and invaded the beaucroatic classes, both provincial and municipal, of which the country was so full. Bastard and foreign words disfigured the speech of all classes, save perhaps the lowest. The language rioted in needless letters and capricious forms. Classicism had dominated all learning. Hooft regarded it as better to understand Latin than to write Dutch. A Latin poet, Barlaeus, and not Vondel was regarded as the chief poet of the seventeenth century. But voices had been raised in the previous century against the neglect of the national language. The purists were not unheard, though their influence was limited. The chambers of rhetoric had exerted a salutary but pedantic influence in behalf of the regulation of the popular speech. With the definite establishment of royal power and the union of the states of the North and South Netherlands in 1815, the government created chairs of the national language and rhetoric in all the universities at present included in the kingdom of the Netherlands and Belgium. The father of Matthias de Vries was then proposed for the professorship in Groningen, which was afterward filled by his more distinguished son.

We cannot characterize this early effort at instruction as puerile; there was enthusiasm and pride in the national literature, though its study was unscientific and often merely stilistic. The forms of the national speech were studied in place of the forms of the classical tongues. We must not absolutely undervalue this work. It was rescued from utter meaninglessness by the advance in linguistic study in Germany. The study of Sanscrit led to the comparative study of language, and Bopp's earliest work appeared about this time (1816) upon the *System of Conjugation in Sanscrit compared with that of Greek, Latin, Persian and Germanic*. The activity of A. W. Schlegel in Oriental studies at Bonn began in 1818, and of Bopp in Berlin in 1821. The study of popular literature had been stimulated in Germany by the publication of Herder's *Volkslieder* (1778-9) and *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1806). The first critical writings upon the mediæval epics of Germany date from the first decade of this century and were followed by Lachmann's powerful influence in text criticism by which an attempt was made not merely to distinguish separate songs which compose the *Nibelungenlied*, but the same searching method was applied to *Parzival* and to other works of the German past. It was this influence which affected the young scholar in Leiden. The philology of the Netherlands is especially indebted to Hoffmann von Fallersleben. This young scholar had intended to go to Italy, thence to Greece, in order to study the monuments of classic art, when he met accidentally Jacob Grimm, who said "Should not your own land stand nearer to you?" The entire direction of his studies was changed. He went to Holland in 1821, and with unwearied industry he began, almost alone, a search through all the libraries and archives of the kingdom for manuscripts of Netherland literature, in which he discovered treasures of priceless value. He was the first great explorer in this important field,

and what he accomplished in forty years is preserved in the *Horae Belgicae*. It was thus the influence proceeding from Germany, from the comparative study of language and from the new study of the popular and mediæval literature which stimulated the young scholar of the Netherlands. There was first a sharp contest with the old school. The most spirited and remorseless critic representing the new school was Jonckbloet, afterward the literary historian of the Netherlands. An era of destruction had to precede that of construction. In 1843, through the influence of de Vries, aided by Jonckbloet, Tideman and others, the important society for the promotion of Middle Netherlandic literature and philology was formed to which we owe the publication of the monumental editions of the Dutch writers of that period.

In the same year de Vries received his doctorate for an edition of Hooft's *Warenar*, a translation and revision of his prize thesis of the previous year. Hooft's drama was based on Plautus' *Aulularia*, as was Molière's *Avare*, and de Vries' thesis was a comparison of the Netherland, Latin and French dramas. He was, however, obliged to wait three years for an academic position, when he received the appointment of Second Preceptor in the history and language of the Netherlands in the gymnasium of Leiden. In the interval which elapsed before he received an independent chair he published a contribution to the literature of the cycle of Charlemagne, *Karel de Groote en zijne XII pairs* (1845), and an address upon '*Netherland philology, viewed in its former history, present condition, and the demands for the future*,' (1849). Later, when appointed a professor in Groningen (1849) and in Leiden (1853), it was his duty to represent the two departments of history and language. He never regretted this double direction of his powers. History, besides being the handmaid of literary study, furnished him with the lessons of patriotism and national spirit which characterized all his instruction. His inaugural in Groningen, delivered November 28, 1849, was upon '*The Mastery of Language, the Beginning of Eloquence*.' This inaugural address of the young scholar illustrates the quality of his mind. Never did a youth conceive more clearly or maintain more consistently one grand purpose. The lives of few men are clear to them from the beginning. Here was one who had a definite mission from the first: that mission was not sought for the office which it brought, but his purpose determined his career. Had any position been offered to him which would have required him to sacrifice his chosen purpose, it would have been, I believe, unhesitatingly declined. He said, "I feel that this solemn hour is not to be wasted in empty ceremonies or in the idle resonance of words, but that I must fulfill in connection with a venerated custom, a higher duty. At the entrance of the way which I am to tread you may properly demand to know the direction which I have prescribed to myself and purpose to commend to others; you wish to know what principle shall guide me on my way, what conceptions I shall seek to realize." In the words that follow both the scholar and the eloquent orator were revealed. Herder's

conception of language as embodying the thoughts and feelings, indeed the inner history of humanity had entered into the young scholar. "Language, he said, is individual as well as general; it includes a clear conception of the original meaning of every word, the force of every form and the nature of every change. The determination of the laws which shape the forms of speech and the phenomena of human expression in other languages are all alike to be studied. Every trace of the thought and feeling which former generations and races have impressed upon language must be investigated, as well as every ray illustrating the history of humanity. Language, originally the picturesque expression of the sensuous world, received within it, has taken up the supersensuous; every emotion in the realm of thought, every experience in the realm of feeling has been poured into the great flood of human speech, to afford in turn the foundation of a new development. Language is the faithful mirror in which the soul and spirit, not of one man but of the human race is reflected. In a word, language is a picture of man. The picture of the nation is its language." De Vries recognized clearly the important principle that all the influences which had affected language in the past were equally at work at the present time. To save the philologist from dealing in dry forms, with mere grammatical correspondences, the living languages were to be studied. Thus the student will be saved from that parched learning which recognizes no life in language but only dead words and forms, in which so many linguists have wrecked the finest powers. The living language must be studied as it springs from the heart of the people, but we cannot rest in the study of the present, but we must seek its explanation in the past. Thus we come to the historical study of language. This alone is the fountain from which all higher linguistic study must proceed.

In these views, expressed nearly fifty years ago, one of the most fruitful methods of modern linguistic study was emphasized, whose importance has only recently been fully recognized. Linguistic study must enrich language, make men eloquent with new and finer conceptions, must touch life, this was the conception of the speaker. He closed his inaugural with an eloquent apostrophy to the great men of the University of Leiden—the city of Minerva, to Boerhave and Hemsterhuis, whose spirits hovered over it, to whom he and they were indebted, and in whose spirit they must labor.

But the time had come when he was to enter upon the great work of his life. The union of the North and South Netherlands had been severed by the revolution in 1830. The bonds which bound the two kingdoms together were those of past history and the treasure of a common language and literature. To unite them again in common sympathy must be the work of patriotic scholars. The first philological congress of the two sections was held at Ghent in 1849. The great need of a historical dictionary of their common language was there presented, and a committee was appointed to draw up a plan for it. In the following year when the congress met in Amsterdam no union of views had been attained. The

importance of the great work was still recognized, and a new commission was appointed to outline the features of the proposed work. Three members from both the North and the South Netherlands were appointed, but the work devolved upon the secretary, the leading spirit in the movement, Professor de Vries. His report was presented in Brussels at the third congress in 1851. It was in January of the following year that Jacob Grimm received the first proofs of his great German lexicon. The basis of the dictionary was to be the entire language of the North and the South Netherlands, as at present constituted, in its general and established use. The dictionary was to include the language from the year 1637, the date of the translation of the Bible authorized by the States-General. No antiquated words or meanings were to be admitted. Words from the writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were to be received only as they retained in some respect a present value. Peculiar words were to be admitted only as far as they illustrated an idea for which the general language had no suitable term.

With the above exception of obsolete and provincial words, all words and meanings usual in any variety of written speech and not confined to literature, were to be included to the widest extent.

Especial attention was to be paid to the spoken language, and an attempt was to be made to collect all words in use within proper limits and rather too many than too few.

In treating South Netherlandic, special care was to be taken to guard against the numerous French words that had come into the language and were struggling for supremacy in it. Characteristic technical terms, native in origin, were to be carefully noted and retained, among these was the large class of words relating to navigation and fishing which have passed into English, German and Russian. Fixed forms existing in proverbs and familiar expressions were to be preserved. Foreign words, naturalized or capable of being so, after the analogy of Netherlandic forms, were to be retained. The proposed etymological arrangement was abandoned and the alphabetical substituted, as experience and the advice of Jacob Grimm and others suggested. A concise etymology was to be given when it could be determined in a trustworthy way. Definitions were to proceed from the generic in their historic development. All meanings were to be illustrated by careful quotations from Netherland classics. Synonyms were to be distinguished. The spelling of the North then in vogue was to be adopted, not, however, excluding a revised spelling which the editors in time might determine to be necessary. A practical aim was to prevail throughout this dictionary: it was not to be a historical dictionary save within certain definite limits. The proposed scheme was unanimously adopted and a commission of six, three from the North and three from the South Netherlands, appointed to carry into effect the conclusions of the congress. The method originally proposed of assigning specific parts in the definition of every word to a separate editor, as the collection, arrangement of defini-

tions, synonyms, etymology, illustrative passages, etc., was abandoned as impracticable.

As a matter of fact the great Netherlandic Dictionary is the product of the North and not of the South. One by one the editors from Belgium failed, as also those from the North. L. A. te Winkel, a gifted and favorite pupil of de Vries, was his first co-worker, who died, however, in 1868. Successive reports upon the progress of the work were made in 1854 at Utrecht; in 1856 at Antwerp; in 1860 in Hertogenbosch; and in 1862 in Bruges.

The problem of how to execute this elaborate enterprise was a formidable one. It involved reading and making excerpts from the entire literature of the period from 1637, and in carefully studying the previous history of words; in forming collections of the spoken language of various sections of both kingdoms, and great lists of technical words relating to special crafts, as well as of foreign words which had been borrowed by the Netherlandic from the Indian colonies. The expense of the great undertaking was but partially provided for, but the entire enterprise would have failed if it had not been for the iron resolution, the tenacious, unshrinking purpose of de Vries. He labored at times single-handed, but undaunted in his great undertaking. Previous experience in lexicography had shown his marvelous gifts. One of his earlier and best known works was an edition of Boendale's *Lekenspiegel*, or '*Laymen's Mirror*.' In this work, the didactic school of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had reached its highest point. It discusses the origin and education of the human race, the sources of ecclesiastical and temporal power, the essence of religious doctrine and symbolism and of Christian morality, and the glorious future of God's kingdom. This book mirrors as few do the spirit of the time; it was written with genuine poetic power and marked facility in illustration. With Maerlant's *Spiegel Historiaal*, it influenced powerfully the popular element in education, government and religion. This work, published in 1844-49, contained a lexicon of Middle Netherlandic which was so skillfully planned, and executed with such thoroughness that it has never been supplanted, and it forms a model of a mediæval glossary. It was the ardent wish of Professor de Vries to publish a lexicon of Middle Netherlandic. For this he had made elaborate collections. In 1856 he published '*Specimens of Middle Netherlandic Textual Criticism, Preparatory Observations upon an intended Dictionary of Middle Netherlandic*.' In this de Vries shows a power possessed by but few editors in an equal degree, namely, in the criticism of manuscripts and in the emendation of corrupt texts. In this field he was conservative, but he had studied so profoundly the language of his country in its different epochs, and was so familiar with its spirit that he discerned the source of inadequate or erroneous expression and the origin of scribal mistakes.

He issued but two parts of his proposed dictionary of Middle Netherlandic, when the claims of his great work called him away from it. Two

of his pupils, Verdam and Verwijs, took up the plan which their master had so reluctantly dropped, and, embodying his ideas, have dedicated their new and important work to him.

One other great—probably Professor de Vries' greatest work as an editor—was his edition of Maerlant's *Spiegel Historiae* (in three parts, 1858–63). Maerlant—called by contemporaries the greatest of all German poets—certainly one of the most voluminous, wrote this, his most important work between 1284 and 1290. De Vries had a profound acquaintance, not only with classical but also with mediæval and later Latin. He was familiar with early Christian apocryphal, mystical, prophetic and symbolic literatures. He was thus able to point out the sources of the seventh and eighth books of Velthem's *Reimkroniek*, and the sources from which the Latin chroniclers had derived their material. He was thus able to explain obscure passages in mediæval poetry where the poet himself had misunderstood or changed the meaning of his original. He rediscovered in Boendale parts of a lost Pseudo gospel of Matthew, *De Nativitate et Infantia Mariae* and showed that it was a continuation of *De Infantia Salvatoris*.

But the great task of editing a standard dictionary of the language, divided as it is into two great divisions of northern and southern, and in which not only the southern language had been colored by words and expressions from the French and Walloon, but where Frisian, Frankish and Saxon had exercised a common influence, imposed an additional task which had indeed been foreseen, viz., a revision of the spelling of the language. Kluit, in the seventeenth century (1763, 1777), had outlined with great sagacity a system of orthography for the Dutch people; Siegenbeek had prepared in 1805, by direction of the government, an official spelling, which had not, however, been universally adopted. Many writers proceeded upon a definite set of principles which they had themselves elaborated. Many points, however, had been left untouched. A scientific and philological basis was lacking. Many Flemings adhered to their old spelling, partly from habit, partly from jealousy of a foreign system. De Vries' co-laborer, te Winkel, prepared an outline of the proposed national orthography (1863), which was illustrated with word-lists prepared by de Vries. Upon the principles thus stated the new lexicon was prepared. By degrees all elementary text-books in schools were based upon it, as well as all literary works. Belgium adopted the reformed orthography as early as 1873, but the government of the Netherlands clung with native and official pertinacity to the old spelling. It was in vain that the Minister of Justice insisted that all reports and legal documents should be written in the revised orthography. Official obstinacy triumphed over light until 1883, when a formal approval and endorsement was received from the government, twenty years after the introduction of the new system and ten years after it had been introduced into a neighboring kingdom.

One by one Professor de Vries' co-laborers left him for other work. Te Winkel died in the service of the dictionary in 1868; Verwijs retired in

1880, and later Cosijn, and the veteran scholar struggled on alone. At last the government made a royal grant which secured the completion of the work and energetic and able young scholars trained by the master were won to its support, A. Kluyver, A. Beets, J. W. Muller, C. C. Uhlenbeek and W. L. Vreese. What are the characteristics which distinguish this great work? The first part of Grimm's *Lexicon* was published in 1852. This noble enterprise was always before de Vries, but his own dictionary was not modeled after it. In many things superiority must be conceded to the Netherland dictionary. De Vries aimed first at completeness, but it was a completeness in which conciseness and clearness should prevail; his greatest gift was in definition, in distinguishing subtle shades of meaning and the order of their development. He laid great stress upon discriminating the delicate force of particles, prefixes and suffixes in compound words, and in clearly defining synonyms. In all these particulars he has perhaps never been surpassed. He wished to live to finish certain letters such as S and others, to which he had devoted particular attention, one of which was rich in nautical terms of which the Dutch is so full. During the progress of this work de Vries carried on subordinate tasks which would have taxed the energy of less able scholars. He published in 1860 van der Bendsen's *North Frisian Language according to the Morunger Dialect*, the manuscript of which was in his hands for six years. He received from the venerable and industrious pastor a confused mass of facts which he reduced to scientific order. He was the editor of the publications of the Society for the Netherlandic Literature, and he published *Baarlam en Josaphat*, *Borchgrave van Couchi*, *Fergunt en Floris*, and *Alsegers en Griet*. He labored at the same time to develop the department with which he was entrusted in the University of Leiden. When but a student de Vries studied Sanscrit under Rutgers, who taught it from general interest in the subject, for there was at that time no chair of Sanscrit in the University. Later de Vries had voluntary classes in this subject, both in Groningen and Leiden. Many years later (1863) he was gratified by the appointment of Hendrik Kern, one of his own pupils, to this separate chair, who is to-day one of the most eminent of living scholars in the Oriental languages and who has himself lectured to Brahmins in Sanscrit.

Similarly, de Vries, as an undergraduate, studied the related Germanic languages. He constantly urged upon the Minister of Education the need of new departments in the University, but it was not until 1860 that his own chair was divided, and the work in history entrusted to R. Fruin, later deservedly famous for his accurate investigations in the history of the Netherlands.

De Vries has contributed little to the history of literature save by the critical texts which he has published. In 1850 he wrote a valuable essay upon the 'Causes of the Decline and Fall of Middle Netherlandic Literature.' He believed that the gifts of a literary historian were different from

those of a philologist, though brilliant exceptions occur. The second step in the development of his work was taken, when, in 1883 he succeeded in securing the appointment of his early coadjutor, Jonckbloet, the author of the *History of the Netherlandic Literature*, to this particular chair, and Cosijn was made Professor of General Germanic philology, including instruction in the Germanic languages, other than Netherlandic.

De Vries possessed in a high degree the gifts of a popular speaker. His impassioned addresses upon the history of his native land made him the favorite orator of his country upon occasions of national interest. Thus he delivered at Damme the address upon the erection of a memorial to Maerlant (1860); at the Hague, when Bilderdijk's memory was similarly honored (1867); at Briel, when the nation celebrated the victory of the famous "Beggars of the Sea" (1872), where Mr. Motley received in the presence of the king and court the highest honors of the University of Leiden; also when the monuments to Hooft in Amsterdam (1881) and to William of Orange at Delft (1884) were dedicated. When the nation celebrated the seventieth birthday of Beets, its most loved poet and author (1884), the address of de Vries won the admiration of the whole Dutch people. When the relief of Leiden was celebrated in 1884, and the monument to the sturdy burgo-master of the siege, van der Werf, was erected, he was again the orator, as also in 1874, when, in the famous Senate Chamber of the University, which Scaliger pronounced the most memorable room in Europe in the history of letters, he welcomed the assembled delegates from all the universities of Europe to celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of its foundation. His services received royal recognition from both the kingdoms of the Netherlands, which honored him with decorations conferring the rank of knighthood. He was made also an honorary member of the Berlin Academy of Science.

His public services were so great that it is difficult to conceive rightly of the time which he devoted to intercourse with his pupils. He was ready to sacrifice the urgent demands of his great work if he could assist a single student. It is not strange that with one accord the most eminent scholars of his country in all universities do him homage as the greatest of their teachers—Verwijs, Kern, Moltzer, Huet, te Winkel, Verdam, van Helten, Gallée, Wilson, Nolen, Cosijn, Muller, Stoett, Kalf, Northier and Kluyver. Even students in other branches who were taught by him in his early professorship, when he lectured upon rhetoric, and interpreted his country's greatest writers as masters of style, were inspired by the eloquence with which he influenced all who listened to his words.

His personal qualities and his generous enthusiasm for his beloved studies caused him to recognize generously all who labored in them. The Grimms, Hoffmann, Bopp, Hildebrand and many of the great scholars of Germany sought his advice and rejoiced in his friendship, and, in your presence, I do but faint justice to this illustrious scholar in this rapid review of his services to those studies to which our own lives are dedicated.

The discussion of this paper was opened by Dr. B. J. Vos:

It seems peculiarly fitting that at this memorial meeting a tribute should also have been paid to the memory of Matthias de Vries, who in many ways occupied in Holland a position as commanding as that held by Whitney in our land. Nor does it matter that this homage comes somewhat late—rather more than two years after death; there was nothing of the ephemeral in either the man or his work.

It might be difficult to add much important detail to the appreciative study Prof. Hewett has just given us, and so I shall chiefly confine myself to some more general points of view that naturally present themselves to one who is not a foreigner to Holland.

As Prof. Hewett has pointed out, de Vries was chiefly known as the Lexicographer. Carrying this out a little further, we may say that to the wider circle of the educated in Holland he was known as the author, with te Winkel, of the *Woordenlijst der Nederlandsche Taal*. This work is of great importance in the history of Dutch orthography. It has become authoritative in matters of spelling and determination of gender. As such it was to prepare the way for the larger work, and no attempt was made at definition.

To the narrower circle, though not so narrow after all, he was the editor-in-chief of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, and to this he devoted the greater part of his life. Of the fascicles that have appeared—some sixty—de Vries prepared about one-half, either alone or in conjunction with others. It should be added that the dictionary is somewhat more comprehensive than was stated by the reviewer. It was the original intention, to be sure, only to include words existing in 1637, but this was afterwards extended to reach back as far as 1580.¹

As a student of language de Vries' interests lay mainly in the direction of semasiology, not so much in that of etymology proper. This may be seen very well from his *Verspreide taalkundige Opstellen*, edited by his son and published a few months ago. His point of departure in almost every instance is agreement or difference in meaning, and by this he is led to etymological identification or differentiation: essentially the point of view of the lexicographer, the student of language from within. Many of these word-studies were, in fact, the outcome of work on the dictionary.

One more familiar with German methods would, on looking over the philological work of de Vries, at once be struck with a certain discursiveness of style, what Germans might call 'bebagliche Breite.' A note that a German scholar would compress into one or two pages is spun out over four or five. Every detail is worked out and the author takes an evident pleasure in the telling. While this is perhaps in part a national characteristic, it is also partly intentional. That scholarly work in Holland may find a public, it is necessary to interest wider circles, and so the author

¹See *Intleiding to Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, p. xl.

addresses himself to the average schoolmaster rather than to the technical scholar. The good side of it is that such a wider public is reached, witness the enormous list of subscribers to the *Woordenboek*, numbering over 8,000 at the last report. For a country as small as Holland this is truly remarkable.

One word more concerning the study of Dutch, a question that the reading of this paper naturally brings up. It has been quite neglected in this country. Aside from one or two institutions, which need not be named here, it has not been pursued at all. Now I would not urge the desirability of studying Dutch independently of German: we are hardly ready for that at present. But for the student of German, the University-student of German, a study of Dutch is indispensable. That it is so for the student of Comparative German Grammar, should hardly need pointing out; still, even there, it has again and again been overlooked by German scholars, as de Vries took occasion to point out gently now and then.

But in matters of literature as well, the history of 17th Century German literature cannot be adequately understood without a constant reference to the Dutch influence. Nor is the intrinsic value of the literature to be lightly thought of. It has the merit of being intensely individual, national. To one ignorant of German this may be a hindrance to true appreciation, but to the student of German it reveals a new side of Germanic life and thought. The 'Blüteperiode' has perhaps been passed, the language no longer bears the stamp that it did in the hands of a Vondel, but it has always retained a marvelous poetic power. In certain spheres, as in that of the pastoral idyl, Dutch to my mind stands unrivaled, though this may be due to special causes, founded in the relation of the spoken to the written language.

Mr. F. De Haan :

It is a pleasant duty for a Hollander, and for one who once was a student of Professor de Vries, who has just been commemorated here, to state in a session of the Modern Language Association of America that he is greatly gratified by the very fact that a man like de Vries should be mentioned here at all. This is one more proof of the generous spirit of American scholars, because, as everybody must be aware, in Germany they do not usually acknowledge that a Hollander has done good linguistic work; in France they never concern themselves about the matter, except in regard to other fields of study; in England—well, England is England.

The work of Prof. de Vries has been outlined here, and the importance of the Dutch language for Germanic scholars has also been shown; let me add a few words in commemoration of de Vries as a professor and as a man.

It is among Holland students an old, if an antiquated custom, to call upon the Professor once in a few weeks, smoke a long churchwarden, drink a cup of tea, and afterwards, with a sigh of relief, adjourn to a club-house and be glad that the meeting will not be repeated in the next few weeks. All of

which is not conducive to enjoyment or to study; the duty of the call fulfilled, the day's work is done, and the rest of the evening is dedicated to pleasure instead of work. But it is considered of importance that the students should be thus socially brought together with their Professor, and they cannot afford to stay away, for a professor in Holland is but human: it may be different in other countries.

Everybody considers these meetings a great bore, more a task than a pleasure. But at de Vries' house it was different. Here everything went on informally; everybody felt at home at his first appearance, which never was his last. For de Vries' conversation was listened to with pleasure; as homely as he looked, so brilliant was every word he spoke. Thus did one learn to appreciate the power of one's native language, its wealth of expression and its importance for linguistic study. As Dr. Vos has stated, it was once from Dutch, not from Latin and Greek literature, that Germany derived its outside influence, and every student of English is aware of the important relations between the Dutch and the English languages. About this subject de Vries would be eloquent, and his words made a deep impression, for many, especially younger people, in Holland are inclined to consider their native tongue as unfit for literary purposes and their literature as offering no interest. Even such listeners would be inspired by de Vries' enthusiasm and beautiful choice of phrase, and they would enter with greater ardor upon a study they had undertaken because it was prescribed.

This being a session of a Modern Language Association, and Dutch being a modern language that has been considered of sufficient importance to be the subject of the opening paper of our meetings, a few personal reminiscences of de Vries did not seem to me to be out of place.

2. "The relation of early German Romanticism to the classic ideal."¹ By Professor Kuno Francke, of Harvard University.

Professor Henry Wood:

While listening to Professor Francke's criticism of Novalis' *Hymns to Night*, I asked myself, why is it that we smile at the description, and why is it that when Rossetti's *House of Life* is read, one does not smile? The situation is the same: the dead loved one and the living lover. With Rossetti it is the 'eternal womanly,' but Novalis has the further figure of the tear dropping from the heavenly one's eye, and forming a crystal chain which unites the lovers. This inconsistency of attitude towards the two poets may be partly explained by reference to the nature and scope of the

¹ This paper is now published, in this volume (p. 83 f.), under the title: "The social aspect of early German Romanticism."